



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Justin manuscript. If these two are identical, Ptolemæus must have died between 150 and 152 A. D. (2 and 3) Two passages from the Coptic translation of the Acts of Paul, discovered by Schmidt, viz., *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, p. 364, ll. 11-16, and the Martyrdom of Paul, show that their author considered the church at Rome as the leading church of Christendom, and also that he had no actual, personal knowledge of the Neronian persecution described by him. (4) An examination of Commodian, *Carmen apologeticum*, ll. 825-60, a passage based upon Rev. 11:3-13, shows for the first time that the real instigators of the Neronian persecution were the Roman Jews. Erich Klostermann expresses doubts concerning the genuineness of the *In epistolas canonicas enarratio* of Didymus of Alexandria. He reaches this conclusion after a careful study of the Greek catena on the catholic epistles, edited by Cramer.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

BELMONT, MASS.

EARLY CHRISTIAN CATECHISMS

Almost since the day of its discovery the *Didachē* has been recognized as one of the most important pieces of patristic literature. It has been generally recognized from the first that it represents an advanced, rather than the first, stage in the development of the material which it contains. It falls naturally into two divisions, the dividing line being at the end of chap. 6. The first part, containing the material composing the so-called "Two Ways," is by far the more interesting of the two, and with this section are connected the most perplexing questions. Recent years have witnessed a revival of interest in this section, and much has been written to elucidate its problems. One of the factors contributing largely to this renewal of interest was the discovery by J. Schlecht, in 1900, of a Latin version of approximately the material of these first six chapters. A Latin fragment had previously been known, but it was too brief (containing only D 1:1-3a, 2:2-6) to be of much service in solving the problems which here press for discussion. But the service at this point of the Latin found by Schlecht is very considerable. It renders it clear beyond question that there existed in independent form the material of the "Two Ways," and arouses belief in the possibility of the recovery of its text.

Obviously, the first step to the recovery of the original text of the "Two Ways" is a comparison of the witnesses which contain the material so characterized. The first book which we have here to notice¹ is intended

¹ *Die Didache*. Mit kritischem Apparat herausgegeben. Von Hans Lietzmann. Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1903. 16 pages. M. o.30.

to facilitate this task. It belongs to a series of "Kleine Texte für theologische Vorlesungen und Übungen." The text of the whole of D (*Didachē* of Bryennios) is printed with critical apparatus at the top of the page, and on the lower part of the page is printed the Latin of Schlecht, with the variants of M (Gebhardt frag.) and the correctors of L (text of Schlecht's Latin manuscript). No reference is made to critical questions, the simple explanatory introduction occupying but a single page. It is worth while to notice that B (Barnabas) is not quoted in the critical apparatus, but only in the *Citatenapparat*. Thus the author does not regard B as a primary witness of the "Two Ways," but classes it with Hermas and the canonical gospels. A remark at D 4:8 suggests that he regards K (Apostolic Canons) as based directly on D. Lietzmann has produced a convenient and serviceable booklet, but his disposition of B is probably not the most desirable one in any treatment, and is a distinct defect in this little book in view of the purpose which it is intended to serve. Of course, no one would be qualified to express a very intelligent opinion on the questions involved who had not studied the documents which are used in this work.

The second work which falls under consideration here² is a serious study in the literary criticism of the witnesses to the material of the "Two Ways." Dr. Schermann believes that the original of this material was a Jewish catechism, but holds that all known witnesses are the work of Christian hands, and considers it impossible to recover from any one or all of them the original Jewish work. He argues for the primitive character of K, and thinks that in K and B we have the characteristic representatives of the two types of text which the material assumed in the course of its development. The distribution of the teaching among the eleven apostles which we have in K is not an indication of lateness, he thinks, but, on the contrary, is very old. Valuing K thus highly the author uses it in the attempt to determine the original extent of the "Two Ways" in its Christian form. No satisfactory explanation, he avers, has ever been given why K should break off at D 4:8, if the remainder of the teaching or any part of it lay before K's compiler. We must therefore conclude that he did not know it and that it is a later development.

Chapter 6 on close examination shows itself to be the work of the redactor of D, 6:2 being an interpolation, and is intended simply as an easy transition from chaps. 5-7 of D. According to Schermann, B must be the originator of chap. 5. A comparison of D 5:1 with D, chaps. 2-4,

² Eine Eljapostelmoral oder die X-Recension der "beiden Wege." Nach neuem handschriftlichem Material herausgegeben und untersucht. Von Theodor Schermann. München: Lentner, 1903. vii+90 pages.

shows that, with the exception of three words, the latter contains either verbally or essentially all of the sins catalogued in the former; and, further, of the twenty-three words in D 5:1, B has seventeen, which include two of the three not contained in D, chaps. 2-4, the third being found in Romans and *Hermae Pastor* in an adjectival form. If B had D 5:1 (in any recension) before him, it would be difficult to explain why he departs from his usual custom of using the material so freely, and copies it so slavishly here. The view that B is the originator of this catalogue of sins will explain what has heretofore been a difficult question, namely, why B has preserved nothing of D 3:1-6. Having compiled the catalogue, he sees that it would be superfluous to use 3:1-6, since it contains so nearly the same material. The evidence seems to be clear that B is responsible for the material now found in D, chap. 5.

Manuscripts recently discovered (Cod. Paris. and Cod. Napol.) furnish new evidence for the text of K and show that the original limit of this type of text was at the end of D, chap. 4. D 1:3-5 is drawn from *Hermae Pastor*, Mand. II, 4, and we conclude, then, that the most primitive recoverable text of the "Two Ways" is equivalent in the large to D, chaps. 1-4, minus 1:3-5.

This X recension of the "Two Ways" is, by a comparison of the witnesses, quite materially reduced in particular passages, and in form is like K with its *Apostelliste*.

B represents a free reworking of the X recension, and it gained currency and pre-eminence over the X type because it was better suited to the temper of the time. A study of B, D, and X (=K nearly) shows that, while D has preserved the order of X without the *Apostelliste*, it has also included the additions of B. To account for this, we must have an intermediate recension between B and D. This recension (β) is represented, as Schlecht has already seen, in L. It is very probable that the relation which L sustains to B, agreeing with it as against D (e. g., in L 1:1), is due to the translator, and that β , the Greek original of L, agreed more nearly in particular readings with X than with B. D is based directly on β , it being unnecessary to postulate any intermediate recension of the material composing the "Two Ways," but D contains many minor additions to β .

Such is, in brief, the theory of Dr. Schermann as to the relation of these primary witnesses of the "Two Ways." It must be said that it is carefully worked out, and is very interesting and suggestive. Schermann has not only studied all of his material, but is also well acquainted with all previous important work which has been done. Nevertheless, the theory is

open to serious criticism at several points. Everyone must, I think, agree with Dr. Schermann that the evidence is clear to demonstration that in the early decades of the Christian church a writing containing the material under discussion, in the form of a catechism, had an extensive and independent existence. In excluding D, chap. 6, from a place in this document the author is also on firm ground. But in the exclusion of D, chap. 5, as well, and making B the source of this material, his argument is less secure. That the resemblance of D and B as to order is very close here does not argue strongly for the originality of B, since this catalogue is so brief and, from its character as well as its brevity, would very probably be easily mobilized. Its absence from K is not conclusive against its presence in Δ (the original recension of the teaching), since the manuscripts of the K type do not themselves agree in extent (if I understand Schermann correctly), and this type may at one time have included the material of D, chap. 5. Further, this supposition will not explain satisfactorily the absence from B of D 3:1-6. The parallels which Schermann adduces between D 5:1 and D, chaps. 2-4, are, on his own showing, to be found as much in chap. 2 as in 3, and the argument concerning the superfluity of 3:1-6 would apply with equal strength to those portions of D, chaps. 2 and 4, which B does not omit. Besides, a comparison of B, L, K, and D shows such an obvious growth of material at this point in the order as just indicated, and the formal, almost strophic, character of this section marks it off so distinctly, that one can but regard as most natural the suggestion that the material was not known to B, and that it had an independent origin and growth.

The argument of our author is at this point based upon a very high opinion of the value of K or X as a witness to the original form and content of Δ . It is exceedingly doubtful whether this is justified. The distribution of the material to the several apostles seems to the present reviewer to be a mark of lateness rather than primitiveness. The same assumption as to the character of X underlies also the author's position that B is a free reworking of X. It would be difficult to explain on this assumption why the order of X is so nearly retained in L and D, and yet that the compilers had chosen to follow B in spirit and, if Schermann be correct, in additions of material. The supposition of L ($=\beta$) as the intermediate stage between B and D is not sufficient answer, for our criticism applies as much to L as to D.

It is much more probable, and even natural, to say that B represents the form of the material when it had become fairly well crystallized, but before it had yet been put into written form, and that the order of the

material which is followed by every known witness except B is due to the first redactor of the material. Schermann is correct in holding L to be an intermediate stage between B and D. He probably does not, however, give as much consideration as he should to the possibility, and indeed the probability, that L is more largely influenced by B than was its Greek exemplar β . The phenomena seem also to require a recension between β (=L) and B, which we may call Δ . K represents a stage later than β and earlier than the form preserved in D, but it is off the main line of development as represented by B, Δ , β , and D.

The question of date our author has not considered. This question is indirectly connected with the third work we must notice.³ The period when such documents as L, K, and D arose will depend somewhat on the decision as to how early in the history of the church catechetical material began to be formulated. Professor Seeberg thinks that he has adduced proof that in the years "soon after the death of Christ there arose a catechism formed out of the words of the Lord. The content of the same was preached by the missionaries in the apostolic age, and was then taught to those who offered themselves for Christian baptism." He thinks that he has not only "been able to recover the chief elements of the catechism, but also frequently to suggest with more or less certainty its very words." He thinks this catechism contained two parts. The first was a series of rules or directions for moral conduct, and contained both prohibitions and positive commands. This part was known as "The Way," and was an indication to converts and would-be members of the churches, of the kind of life they would be expected to live in their heathen world. This material was incorporated in the church catechisms and manuals of post-apostolic times, and the catalogues of virtues and sins are reflected in many writings of this same period. Such catalogues, he holds, were also existent in Judaism before the time of Jesus. The second part of this catechism was a creed (*Glaubensformel*) to which the catechumens were required to express their assent. Such a formula he sees reflected in 1 Cor. 15:3-5, 1 Peter, the Pastoral, 1 Tim. 3:16, Luke, Hebrews, and throughout Paul. He thinks it contained, as Paul knew it, something like the following: "The living God, who created all things, sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world, who was born of the seed of David, died for our sins according to the Scriptures, was buried, was raised from the dead on the third day according to the Scriptures, appeared to Cephas and the Twelve, and sat down at the right hand of God in the heavens. All powers and authorities and angels being made subordinate to him, he will come upon the clouds

³ *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit.* Von Alfred Seeberg. Leipzig: Deichert, 1903. 282 pages. M. 6.

of heaven with power and great glory." Seeberg does not mean, so he says, that this formula has everywhere and throughout the apostolic age precisely the same form of words, but only that at one time and one place it had the same form. He certainly lacks but little, however, of arguing for the proposition which he thus disavows. His argument is carried out with great elaborateness and even diffuseness, and he shows ample learning and large acquaintance with the literature. It will not, however convince one who does not already share his conviction. He comes perilously near arguing in a circle. He must frequently assume that the formula which he desires to find is implied in a passage, and it is then of course easy to find it. Having then by his questionable method established a probability, he treats this as a certainty, and on the basis of it establish a second probability, which in turn becomes the basis for a new departure. His identification of the formula which he finds reflected in one passage with that of another is not infrequently based on the assumption of the truth of the very proposition it is his task to prove. Likewise his attempt to suggest the *Wortlaut* of the formula is open to the same criticism. The fundamental defect of the whole treatment seems to be a failure to discriminate between the view that the apostolic age held in common certain great facts and truths, with greatly varying form and fulness of expression, and the view which identifies the fact or the truth with the form of words in which it receives expression. That Paul did receive certain things which he handed on to others does not admit of question, but the evidence that he learned it as a catechetical formula and transmitted it as such to others is, even after Professor Seeberg, far from convincing. He seems to think that the establishment of the truth of his thesis would prove a strong apologetic for the Christianity of the church; for its nature as well as that of genuine primitive Christianity would not be a matter of fancy and *Phantasie*, but could be tested by a body of objective material. If he were correct in this view, I fear the ill success with which he has vindicated his position would prove disastrous. I greatly rejoice that such support is not needed. It is rather an incubus.

J. W. BAILEY.

FAIRBURY, ILL.

RECENT WORKS ON THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE

Pfleiderer's views¹ on early Christian history are well known and have been set forth more fully in his *Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften und*

¹ *The Early Christian Conception of Christ: Its Significance and Value in the History of Religion.* By Otto Pfleiderer. New York: Putnam; London, Williams & Norgate, 1905. 170 pages.